

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ALFA PHARMA LLC,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

RRKS INTERNATIONAL GROUP LLC, et  
al.,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO. C24-2119-KKE

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S *EX*  
*PARTE* REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED  
DISCOVERY

According to the complaint in this action, Plaintiff AlfaPharma LLC ("ALFA") entered into a contract with Indian corporation Defendant RRKS Exim Pvt. Ltd. ("RRKS"), for the sale of one million surgical masks from RRKS to ALFA. Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 9. ALFA alleges that it wired hundreds of thousands of dollars to Defendant Rosamaria Peralta, an RRKS principal, so that she would secure the masks for export to ALFA. *Id.* ¶¶ 10–11. According to ALFA, Peralta did not use the wired funds for that purpose and ALFA never received the masks or heard from Peralta again. *Id.* ¶ 14; Dkt. No. 11 at 3.

ALFA filed this lawsuit against Peralta and RRKS, as well as RRKS principal Charan Prasant and RRKS International Group LLC (a Florida entity), asserting that Peralta, Prasant, and RRKS acted as promoters for RRKS International Group. Dkt. No. 1 ¶¶ 9–10. ALFA served Peralta, but she did not appear and the Court entered an order of default against her. Dkt. No. 14. The Court noted that ALFA had not apparently yet served any of the other Defendants, and ordered

1 ALFA to show cause why its claims against the other Defendants should not be dismissed for  
2 failure to prosecute. Dkt. No. 10.

3 ALFA filed a timely response to that order, requesting leave to seek expedited discovery  
4 in order to gather information that will allow it to serve the other Defendants. Dkt. No. 11. ALFA  
5 hired an investigator to obtain information about Peralta and the other Defendants “to aid in  
6 executing on a potential judgment and to locate them and any co-conspirators.” Dkt. No. 11 at 4  
7 (citing Dkt. No. 12 at 26–33). Based on the lack of information available to the investigator, ALFA  
8 seeks to issue subpoenas to Peralta’s bank and other banks where money from Peralta’s account  
9 was sent, along with all U.S. entities Peralta is involved with (which includes RRKS International  
10 Group). *Id.* at 8. ALFA contends that these subpoenas will allow it to locate and serve the other  
11 Defendants and determine whether any other individuals involved should be named as Defendants,  
12 and to determine the scope of Defendants’ scheme to defraud ALFA. *Id.* ALFA offered to file a  
13 status report no later than August 29, 2025, describing its efforts to locate and serve the other  
14 Defendants. *Id.* at 6.

15 “A party may not seek discovery from any source before the parties have conferred as  
16 required by Rule 26(f), except in a proceeding exempted from initial disclosure under Rule  
17 26(a)(1)(B), or when authorized by these rules, by stipulation, or by court order.” Federal Rule of  
18 Civil Procedure 26(d)(1). Here, because only one Defendant has been served and has failed to  
19 appear, ALFA has not been able to confer with any Defendant, and therefore seeks an order from  
20 this Court authorizing expedited discovery.

21 The Ninth Circuit applies a “good cause” test to determine whether expedited discovery is  
22 warranted. “Good cause may be found where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration  
23 of the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party.” *Semitool, Inc.*  
24 *v. Tokyo Electron Am., Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002).

1 The Court finds good cause to permit expedited discovery here. “Courts routinely allow  
 2 early discovery for the limited purpose of identifying defendants on whom process could not  
 3 otherwise be served.” *Amazon.com, Inc. v. Yong*, No. 21-170RSM, 2021 WL 1237863, at \*2  
 4 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 2, 2021) (collecting cases). ALFA has unsuccessfully attempted to locate the  
 5 unserved Defendants and without more information about their activities and whereabouts, may  
 6 not be able to serve them with process. *See* Dkt. No. 12 ¶ 2. The subpoenas ALFA identifies with  
 7 specificity are reasonably calculated to yield information that could be used for this purpose. *See*  
 8 Dkt. No. 12 at 26–33. ALFA’s need for this information outweighs any prejudice to either Peralta,  
 9 who has failed to appear, or to the other Defendants, who have not yet been served.

10 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS ALFA’s *ex parte* request for expedited discovery, as to  
 11 the specific entities identified in ALFA’s request. ALFA may issue subpoenas to:

- 12 (1) Regions Bank, requesting (a) bank statements from the date of the transfer to present,  
 13 including account-transfer information to understand where the money ALFA sent to  
 14 Peralta was sent, and (b) account-holder information and agreements—as necessary;  
 15 and
- 16 (2) RRKS International Group LLC; Urubrasusa Inc.; Urubras-USA Group Inc.; Atlantic  
 17 Beverage Solutions Inc.; Global Providers Services; Pimaro Corporation; Ibusa, LLC;  
 18 Going Global Trading Inc.; Elite Import & Export Inc.; and Elite Unlimited Inc.;  
 19 requesting (i) a list of members or shareholders; and (ii) shareholder agreements, LLC  
 20 agreements, and other operating documents.

21 To the extent ALFA discovers new information warranting additional subpoenas, it may  
 22 file a supplemental motion for expedited discovery with information supporting its request. The  
 23 Court further ORDERS ALFA to file a status report no later than August 29, 2025, detailing its  
 24

1 efforts to locate and serve the other Defendants. The Court hereby DISCHARGES the order to  
2 show cause.

3 Dated this 2nd day of June, 2025.

4 

5 \_\_\_\_\_  
6 Kymberly K. Evanson  
7 United States District Judge  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24